

National Library
of Medicine

PubMed

PubMed	Nucleotide	Protein	Genome	Structure	PopSet	Taxonomy	OMIM
Search	PubMed	▼	for		Go	Clear	
		Limits	Preview/Index	History	Clipboard		

Display	Abstract	▼	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	---	------	------	-------	------------------

Entrez PubMed

1 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1993 Apr 1;90(7) 2905-9 Related Articles, Books, LinkOutFREE full text article at
www.pnas.org

PubMed Services

Human BMP sequences can confer normal dorsal-ventral patterning in the *Drosophila* embryo.

Padgett RW, Wozney JM, Gelbart WM

Department of Cellular and Developmental Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138-2097.

Related Resources

The type beta transforming growth factor family is composed of a series of processed, secreted growth factors, several of which have been implicated in important regulatory roles in cell determination, inductive interactions, and tissue differentiation. Among these factors, the sequence of the DPP protein from *Drosophila* is most similar to two of the vertebrate bone morphogenetic proteins, BMP2 and BMP4. Here we report that the human BMP4 ligand sequences can function in lieu of DPP in *Drosophila* embryos. We introduced the ligand region from human BMP4 into a genomic fragment of the *dpp* gene in place of the *Drosophila* ligand sequences and recovered transgenic flies by P-element transformation. We find that this chimeric *dpp*-BMP4 transgene can completely rescue the embryonic dorsal-ventral patterning defect of null *dpp* mutant genotypes. We infer that the chimeric DPP-BMP4 protein can be processed properly and, by analogy with the action of other family members, can activate the endogenous DPP receptor to carry out the events necessary for dorsal-ventral patterning. Our evidence suggests that the DPP-BMP4 signal transduction pathway has been functionally conserved for at least 600 million years.

PMID: 8464906, UI: 93219393

Display	Abstract	▼	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	---	------	------	-------	------------------

Write to the Help Desk
NCBI | NLM | NIH
Department of Health & Human Services
[Freedom of Information Act](#) | [Disclaimer](#)

National Library
of Medicine

PubMed

PubMed	Nucleotide	Protein	Genome	Structure	PopSet	Taxonomy	OMIM	
Search PubMed	<input type="checkbox"/>	for					Go	Clear
Limits		Preview/Index		History		Clipboard		

Display	Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	--------------------------	------	------	-------	------------------

Entrez PubMed

1: *Cell* 1994 Jul 29;78(2):251-61[Related Articles](#), [Books](#), [Protein](#), [Nucleotide](#), [LinkOut](#)

PubMed Services

Characterization and relationship of Dpp receptors encoded by the saxophone and thick veins genes in *Drosophila*.**Brummel TJ, Twombly V, Marques G, Wrana JL, Newfeld SJ, Attisano L, Massague J, O'Connor MB, Gelbart WM**

Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, University of California, Irvine 92717.

Related Resources

The dpp/BMP family of TGF beta-related factors controls numerous events in pattern formation and morphogenesis. How these polypeptide signals are received and transduced by target cells is largely unknown. We combine molecular and genetic approaches to establish that the *Drosophila* saxophone (sax) gene encodes a dpp receptor. We compare the structural properties and expression patterns of sax with a second dpp receptor encoded by the thick veins (tkv) gene. While the sax gene is expressed ubiquitously, tkv is expressed in a highly localized and dynamic pattern during development. Some, but not all, of the tkv expression pattern parallels that of dpp. Ubiquitous expression of a tkv transgene rescues both tkv and sax loss-of-function mutations. Thus, there is at least partial functional overlap of the sax and tkv receptors in vivo. We consider these observations in terms of possible ligand-receptor interactions during *Drosophila* development.

PMID: 8044839, UI: 94320137

Display	Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/>	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	--------------------------	------	------	-------	------------------

[Write to the Help Desk](#)[NCBI](#) | [NLM](#) | [NIH](#)[Department of Health & Human Services](#)[Freedom of Information Act](#) | [Disclaimer](#)

National Library
of Medicine

PubMed

PubMed	Nucleotide	Protein	Genome	Structure	PopSet	Taxonomy	OMIM		
Search	PubMed	▼	for					Go	Clear
		Limits	Preview/Index	History	Clipboard				

Display	Abstract	▼	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	---	------	------	-------	------------------

Entrez PubMed

1: *Cell* 1998 Jul 24;94(2) 251-60[Related Articles, Books, LinkOut](#)

PubMed Services

decapentaplegic is essential for the maintenance and division of germline stem cells in the *Drosophila* ovary.**Xie T, Spradling AC**

Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Department of Embryology, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Baltimore, Maryland 21210, USA

Related Resources

Stem cells are thought to occupy special local environments, or niches, established by neighboring cells that give them the capability for self-renewal. Each ovariole in the *Drosophila* ovary contains two germline stem cells surrounded by a group of differentiated somatic cells that express hedgehog and wingless. Here we show that the BMP2/4 homolog decapentaplegic (*dpp*) is specifically required to maintain female germline stem cells and promote their division. Overexpression of *dpp* blocks germline stem cell differentiation. Conversely, mutations in *dpp* or its receptor (*saxophone*) accelerate stem cell loss and retard stem cell division. We constructed mutant germline stem cell clones to show that the *dpp* signal is directly received by germline stem cells. Thus, *dpp* signaling helps define a niche that controls germline stem cell proliferation.

PMID: 9695953, UI: 98359124

Display	Abstract	▼	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	---	------	------	-------	------------------

[Write to the Help Desk](#)[NCBI](#) | [NLM](#) | [NIH](#)[Department of Health & Human Services](#)[Freedom of Information Act](#) | [Disclaimer](#)

National Library
of Medicine

PubMed

PubMed	Nucleotide	Protein	Genome	Structure	PopSet	Taxonomy	OMIM
Search PubMed	for					Go	Clear
Limits		Preview/Index		History		Clipboard	

Display	Abstract	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	------	------	-------	------------------

Entrez PubMed

1: *Dev Dyn* 1997 Dec;210(4):371-82[Related Articles, Books, LinkOut](#) **InterScience®**

PubMed Services

Published erratum appears in *Dev Dyn* 1998 Feb;211(2):191**Establishment of stem cell identity in the *Drosophila* germline.****Bhat KM, Schedl P**

Related Resources

Department of Molecular Biology, Princeton University, New Jersey, USA.
KBhat@anatomy.emory.edu

In the adult *Drosophila* ovary the continuous production of eggs depends upon a small group of stem cells located at the anterior tip of the germarium. These stem cells divide asymmetrically to self renew and to generate a cystoblast, which in females is committed to the oocyte differentiation pathway. While much is known about the development of poststem cell cystoblasts, little is known about when stem cells are formed or how their identity is initially established. To investigate these questions we have used the P-M hybrid dysgenesis syndrome as a tool for ablating the "pre-stem cell" progenitors of the stem cells. Our experiments indicate that the pre-stem cells in females assume stem cell identity during the early pupal stage. Our results also suggest a model in which at least two pre-stem cells must be present within an ovariole for the specification of stem cell fate. When only a single pre-stem cell is sequestered by an ovariole, this cell does not assume stem cell identity, but instead follows the cystoblast-cystocyte differentiation pathway.

PMID 9415423, UI: 98075905

Display	Abstract	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	------	------	-------	------------------

[Write to the Help Desk](#)
[NCBI](#) | [NLM](#) | [NIH](#)
[Department of Health & Human Services](#)
[Freedom of Information Act](#) | [Disclaimer](#)

National Library
of Medicine

PubMed

PubMed	Nucleotide	Protein	Genome	Structure	PopSet	Taxonomy	OMIM	
Search PubMed	▼	for					Go	Clear
Limits		Preview/Index		History		Clipboard		

Display	Abstract	▼	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	---	------	------	-------	------------------

Entrez PubMed

1: *Annu Rev Genet* 1997;31:455-91[Related Articles, Books, LinkOut](#)

PubMed Services

The tao of stem cells in the germline.

Lin H

Department of Cell Biology, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina 27710, USA. h.lin@cellbio.duke.edu

Related Resources

Germline stem cells (GSCs) are the self-renewing population of germ cells that serve as the source for gametogenesis. GSCs exist in diverse forms, from those that undergo strict self-renewing asymmetric divisions in *Drosophila* to those that maintain their population by balancing between mitosis and differentiation in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. Most vertebrate spermatogonial GSCs appear to adopt an intermediate strategy. In most animals, GSCs are established during preadult gonadogenesis following the proliferation and migration of embryonic primordial germ cells. GSCs produce numerous gametes throughout the sexually active period of adult life. The establishment and self-renewing division of GSCs are controlled by extracellular signals such as hormones from the hypothalamic-pituitary axis and local interactions between GSCs and their neighboring cells. These extracellular signals may then influence differential gene expression, cell cycle machinery, and cytoskeletal organization of GSCs for their formation and/or divisional asymmetry. In addition, the GSC mechanism is related to that for germline and sex determination. Current knowledge has provided a solid framework for further study of GSCs and stem cells in general.

Publication Types:

- Review
- Review, academic

PMID: 9442904, UI: 98105115

Display	Abstract	▼	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	---	------	------	-------	------------------

[Write to the Help Desk](#)
[NCBI](#) | [NLM](#) | [NIH](#)
[Department of Health & Human Services](#)
[Freedom of Information Act](#) | [Disclaimer](#)

National Library
of Medicine

PubMed

PubMed	Nucleotide	Protein	Genome	Structure	PopSet	Taxonomy	OMIM	
Search	PubMed	<input type="text"/>					Go	Clear
		Limits	Preview/Index	History	Clipboard			

Display	Abstract	<input type="text"/>	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	----------------------	------	------	-------	------------------

Entrez PubMed

1: *Development* 1997 Dec;124(24):5149-59Related Articles, Books, Protein, Nucleotide,
LinkOut

PubMed Services

Development

Functional analysis of an ascidian homologue of vertebrate Bmp-2/Bmp-4 suggests its role in the inhibition of neural fate specification.

Miya T, Morita K, Suzuki A, Ueno N, Satoh N

Department of Zoology, Graduate School of Science, Kyoto University, Japan.

Related Resources

The ascidian tadpole larva is thought to be close to a prototype of the ancestral chordate. The vertebrate body plan is established by a series of inductive cellular interactions, whereas ascidians show a highly determinate mode of development. Recent studies however, suggest some roles of cell-cell interaction during ascidian embryogenesis. To elucidate the signaling molecules responsible for the cellular interaction, we isolated HrBMPb, an ascidian homologue of the vertebrate bone morphogenetic protein (BMP) gene, from *Halocynthia roretzi*. The amino acid sequence of HrBMPb closely resembled those of vertebrate BMP-2 and BMP-4 and of *Drosophila* Decapentaplegic (DPP). In addition to the sequence similarity, HrBMPb overexpression induced the ventralization of *Xenopus* embryos, suggesting functional conservation. The zygotic expression of HrBMPb was first detected around gastrulation. HrBMPb expression was maintained in some cells at the lateral edges of the neural plate through gastrulation to neurulation, although that in the presumptive muscle cells was downregulated. HrBMPb was not expressed in the presumptive epidermis during gastrulation. When HrBMPb mRNA was injected into fertilized *Halocynthia* eggs, cells that normally give rise to the neural tissue differentiated into epidermis, causing a loss of anterior neural tissue in the larva. In addition, HrBMPb might function synergistically with HrBMPa, an ascidian homologue of BMPs-5 to 8. However, HrBMPb overexpression did not affect differentiation of the notochord and muscle cells. These results suggest that HrBMPb functions as a neural inhibitor and as an epidermal inducer but not as a ventralizing agent in ascidian development.

PMID: 9362472, UI: 98090067

Display	Abstract	<input type="text"/>	Save	Text	Order	Add to Clipboard
---------	----------	----------------------	------	------	-------	------------------

Human BMP sequences can confer normal dorsal–ventral patterning in the *Drosophila* embryo

(decapentaplegic/human BMP4/embryonic rescue/chimeric genes)

RICHARD W. PADGETT^{*†}, JOHN M. WOZNEY[‡], AND WILLIAM M. GELBART^{*}

^{*}Department of Cellular and Developmental Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138-2097; and [‡]Genetics Institute, Cambridge Park Drive, Cambridge, MA 02140-2387

Communicated by Fotis C. Kafatos, December 30, 1992 (received for review November 25, 1992)

ABSTRACT The type β transforming growth factor family is composed of a series of processed, secreted growth factors, several of which have been implicated in important regulatory roles in cell determination, inductive interactions, and tissue differentiation. Among these factors, the sequence of the DPP protein from *Drosophila* is most similar to two of the vertebrate bone morphogenetic proteins, BMP2 and BMP4. Here we report that the human BMP4 ligand sequences can function in lieu of DPP in *Drosophila* embryos. We introduced the ligand region from human BMP4 into a genomic fragment of the *dpp* gene in place of the *Drosophila* ligand sequences and recovered transgenic flies by *P*-element transformation. We find that this chimeric *dpp*–BMP4 transgene can completely rescue the embryonic dorsal–ventral patterning defect of null *dpp* mutant genotypes. We infer that the chimeric DPP–BMP4 protein can be processed properly and, by analogy with the action of other family members, can activate the endogenous DPP receptor to carry out the events necessary for dorsal–ventral patterning. Our evidence suggests that the DPP–BMP4 signal transduction pathway has been functionally conserved for at least 600 million years.

The type β transforming growth factor (TGF- β) family is composed of several members of a secreted family of polypeptides that have profound effects on cell growth and differentiation (1–6). Their effect on cells occurs through binding to specific serine/threonine kinase receptors that transduce signals that alter the expression of downstream genes. The developmental effects of this growth factor family cover a wide spectrum but are usually associated with negative growth control.

In *Drosophila*, there are two known TGF- β -like members, the *dpp* gene and the *60A* gene. The *dpp* ligand acts in a signal transduction pathway to establish the identity of dorsal ectoderm in the early embryo. Later in development, the DPP protein is involved in other morphological events, such as visceral mesoderm formation and disk development. Mutations in the *60A* gene have not been identified, but its expression pattern suggests a role in embryonic mesoderm and ectoderm determination.

All nascent polypeptides of the TGF- β family members that have been studied are proteolytically processed to produce a propeptide and a mature polypeptide. The C-terminal mature region (in dimeric form) is the bioactive part of the molecule that binds the appropriate cellular receptors. It is the mature region, typically 110–130 amino acids long, that contains the seven invariant cysteine residues characteristic of all family members. The similarity of *dpp* to other TGF- β -like molecules follows a continuum, with the human BMP2/BMP4 proteins being most similar. DPP and BMP2/BMP4 are 75% identical over the C-terminal 100 amino acids

of the mature region (Fig. 1A) and $\approx 30\%$ identical in the propeptide region (7). Besides these high levels of sequence conservation, the localization of three *dpp* point mutations that disrupt all phenotypes controlled by *dpp* indicates that this C-terminal 100-amino acid domain is required for all *dpp* functions (K. Wharton, R. Ray, and W.M.G., unpublished results).

We have begun to examine whether the extensive structural similarity reflects functional conservation of DPP to BMP2/BMP4. We are defining functional conservation to mean a mechanistic conservation rather than a common set of cells or tissues affected by these protein factors. Presumably, the developmental potential of the cell will determine the consequences of signaling by these growth factor ligands, as is true for the effects *dpp* has on the developing *Drosophila*. For this purpose, we have used the earliest requirement for the *dpp* gene, determination of embryonic dorsal ectoderm (8–10), as a bioassay. We have constructed chimeric molecules and asked whether they are able to rescue the dorsal ectoderm of animals lacking *dpp*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Generation of Molecular Constructs. To facilitate construction of the chimeric genes, restriction sites were introduced into the appropriate clones. *Nar* I and *Sca* I restriction sites were introduced into *dpp* or *BMP4* by site-directed mutagenesis using mutant oligonucleotides (11). A *Nar* I site was introduced after the first conserved cysteine in the C terminus of the mature ligand region. The *Sca* I site was introduced after the termination codon of the protein. The introduction of new restriction sites did not change any of the amino acids encoded by either gene. The entire mutagenized insert was sequenced to verify that no unwanted mutations were introduced during the *in vitro* manipulations. The remainder of the coding region outside the *Nar* I and *Sca* I sites is derived from the *Hin* region of the *Drosophila dpp* gene. An 8-kb fragment containing the *dpp*–BMP4 chimeric gene was cloned into the *P*-element transformation vector CaSpeR (12).

***Drosophila* Strains and Manipulations.** *dppH61* is a small deficiency that removes most of the 3' coding exon of *dpp* (13) and *Df(2L)DTD48* is a deficiency for all of *dpp* (14). *SM6a* is a balancer for the second chromosome (15). Strains containing multiple copies of the chimeric transposon were generated by transposing the construct onto the desired chromosome with a strain containing an active transposase (16) or by recombining multiple copies onto a single chromosome. Germ-line transformants were obtained by standard techniques (17). Cuticle preparations were done on embryos as described (18).

Abbreviation: TGF- β , type β transforming growth factor.

[†]Present address: Waksman Institute and Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08855-0759.

The publication costs of this article were defrayed in part by page charge payment. This article must therefore be hereby marked "advertisement" in accordance with 18 U.S.C. §1734 solely to indicate this fact.




FIG. 1. Relationship of *dpp* and *BMP4*. (A) C-terminal alignment of DPP and BMP4 polypeptides. Solid boxes in place of amino acid sequences indicate perfect matches between the two factors. Asterisks denote increments of 10 amino acids in the sequence. (B) Alignment of amino acid sequences around the common intervening sequence. Shown are sequences on both sides of the introns of the *dpp* and *BMP4* genes, which allow for unambiguous placement of the intron.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Conservation of Gene Structure. In addition to the sequence similarities of the DPP and BMP2/BMP4 polypeptides, there are considerable parallels between their transcripts. While the *dpp* gene (>55 kb) produces several transcripts, each has a similar structure (8). Each transcript consists of a unique 5' untranslated exon together with common middle and 3' exons. Because the open reading frame is entirely contained within the middle and 3' exons, all *dpp* transcripts encode the identical polypeptide (R.W.P. and W.M.G., unpublished

results). BMP2 and BMP4 have 5' noncoding exons as well. Furthermore, like *dpp*, the coding regions of BMP2 and BMP4 are contained in two exons (J.M.W., unpublished results). The position of the intron between the two coding exons is in exactly the same position for all three genes. This is apparent by examining the alignment of protein sequences around this intron of the three genes (Fig. 1B). Sequences just upstream (ANTVRSF) and downstream (AELQ/R) of the splice sites for *dpp* and BMP2/BMP4 permit an exact alignment of the proteins in this region. Strikingly, the splice sites are at identical positions, after the first base in the fourth




FIG. 2. *dpp*-BMP4 chimera rescue experiments. (A) Structure of the mRNA derived from the *dpp*-BMP4 chimeric transgene. Solid box represents human BMP4 ligand sequences that were introduced into the chimeric construct as a replacement for comparable sequences of the DPP ligand. Fusion site of the DPP and human BMP4 polypeptides is at the first conserved cysteine in the C terminus (amino acid 485 in the DPP sequence and 306 in BMP4) (see arrows in Fig. 1A). 30 amino acids from the putative proteolytic cleavage site (20, 21). Other than this DPP sequence and 306 in BMP4, the ligand is totally derived from BMP4. Asterisk indicates position of the common intron between the middle and 3' exons. *dpp* genomic sequences extend for 1 kb on the 5' and 1.5 kb on the 3' side of the *Hin* transcription unit. UT, untranslated region. (B) Summary of chimera rescue experiments. (Left) Position in the *dpp* gene where the sequences for the rescue are derived. Transposons that contain the entire *Hin* region of *dpp* are capable of rescuing animals to hatching (19). (Right) Mutant phenotypes obtained by different doses of wild-type *dpp* and chimeric transposons.

codon C-terminal to the ANTVERSF motif. The structural parallels between their processed transcripts further strengthen the argument that *dpp* and BMP2/BMP4 have a common evolutionary origin.

The Chimeric Gene Can Rescue *Drosophila* Embryos. To test whether the human BMP ligand sequences could substitute for *dpp* in early development, we chose to replace the *Drosophila dpp* sequences with the human counterpart. In *Drosophila*, the formation of the dorsal ectoderm offers a sensitive bioassay for function. The dorsal-ventral patterning function of *dpp* in embryonic development is contained within an 8-kb fragment spanning the centrally located *Hin* region of the *dpp* gene (19). This region includes the most abundant *dpp* embryonic transcription unit (6, 8) together with sufficient cis-regulatory sequences to confer expression of *dpp* in the dorsal ectoderm during blastoderm and germ-band extension stages (R.W.P. and W.M.G., unpublished data). If transgenic constructs produce sufficient amounts of correctly regulated *dpp* activity, animals completely lacking endogenous *dpp* gene activity will hatch to larvae and display a normal larval cuticular pattern. For the 8-kb *Drosophila Hin* region construct, two copies of the transgene typically fully rescue dorsal-ventral patterning in a *dpp* null genetic background. We chose to attempt the rescue of a *dpp* null animal with our chimeric transgene rather than to attempt to create gain-of-function phenotypes by ectopic expression, since rescue directly and stringently tests whether the transgene can fulfill the normal requirement for *dpp* activity in its signal transduction pathway.

We have introduced a chimeric *Hin* region rescue transgene, in which the bulk of the ligand region (amino acids 485–588) was derived from the human *BMP4* gene (Fig. 2A), using standard *P*-element-mediated germ-line transformation (17). In these experiments, we did not want to determine whether the C-terminal proteolytic processing was conserved between *Drosophila* and humans. For this reason, we selected amino acids 485–588 encoded by the human gene for the *dpp*–*BMP4* swap to ensure that we were not replacing the C-terminal sequences necessary for protease recognition and cleavage of the mature ligand from the propeptide region. If the chimeric protein was not properly processed, then we would not be able to test whether it was able to function in place of the endogenous *dpp* gene. The phenotypic effects of this chimeric transgene in *dpp* mutant backgrounds were compared to those of a *Hin* transgene composed solely of *Drosophila dpp* sequences.

We have observed functional *dpp*⁺ activity of the chimeric constructs in several genotypes with reduced or no endogenous *dpp* activity. For example, a single copy of the chimeric transgene is sufficient to rescue fully the otherwise haplolethal *dpp*⁺/*Df(2L)dpp* genotype (data not shown). The most striking demonstration of the activity of the chimeric transposon comes from genotypes totally lacking endogenous *dpp* activity (Figs. 2B and 3; Table 1). This genotype is heterozygous for two *dpp* deletions: a large one in which the entire chromosomal region surrounding *dpp* has been removed [*Df(2L)DTD48*] and a small one in which most or all of the 3' exon, including the ligand coding region, is missing (*dpp*^{H61}). In such a *dpp* null background, partial and full rescue of




FIG. 3. Dark-field micrographs of cuticle preparations of wild-type and transgenic embryos. Dorsal is on top and anterior is on the left. All animals were derived from crosses that resulted in offspring containing the *dpp*^{H61} and *Df(2L)DTD48* null *dpp* alleles and different numbers of transposons as indicated. Rescuing activity can be observed by comparing the mutant phenotype of a *dpp* null allele (D) with different doses of the transposon (A–C). (A) Phenotype of a wild-type larva. The cuticle of this larva is indistinguishable from one mutant for *dpp*^{H61}/*Df(2L)DTD48* and harboring three or four copies of the chimeric transgene. (B) Mutant phenotype of a *dpp*^{H61}/*Df(2L)DTD48* embryo containing two copies of the transgene. Note that the primary defects of these embryos reside in the head and terminal region, reminiscent of mutant phenotypes seen in weak *dpp* alleles. (C) Mutant phenotype of an embryo containing one copy of the transposon. Note the more severe reductions in cephalic structures and the posterior fülzkörper relative to B. (D) Mutant phenotype of a *dpp* null embryo. This *dpp*^{H61}/*Df(2L)DTD48* embryo lacks all endogenous *dpp* function and contains no transgene. This results in the complete absence of dorsal epidermis; there is a concomitant expansion of the ventral epidermal domain around the entire circumference of the embryo.

Table 1. Crosses to determine effects of the chimeric transgene on rescue of *dpp* null genotypes

Cross	Cross to generate test embryos		Resulting progeny*	
	♀ parent	♂ parent	Total fertilized eggs	% dead eggs
1	<i>dpp¹⁶¹/CyO-P23¹</i>	<i>Df(2L)DTD48/CyO-P23</i>	378	46 [‡]
2	<i>dpp¹⁶¹ TnA[§]/SM6a</i>	<i>Df(2L)DTD48 TnB/+</i>	1480	24 [¶]
3	<i>Df(2L)DTD48 TnC/SM6a</i>	<i>dpp¹⁶¹ TnA/+</i>	621	29
4	<i>dpp¹⁶¹ TnA TnD/SM6a</i>	<i>Df(2L)DTD48 TnB/+</i>	304	1
5	<i>dpp¹⁶¹ TnA TnD/SM6a</i>	<i>Df(2L)DTD48 TnC TnD/-</i>	504	4
6	<i>dpp¹⁶¹ TnA TnE/SM6a</i>	<i>Df(2L)DTD48 TnC TnD/-</i>	1379	6

*Embryos from brief egg lay collections were placed on medium-containing grids. Unfertilized eggs (white eggs) and dead embryos (discolored eggs) were counted 24–36 hr later.

[†]*dpp¹⁶¹* and *Df(2L)DTD48* are haplolethal. To create viable balanced strains containing these mutations, a transgene containing a second copy of the *dpp* *Hin* region was transposed onto the standard *CyO* balancer. This derived balancer, *CyO-P23*, contributes sufficient *dpp*⁺ activity to rescue balanced *dpp* null alleles.

[‡]Approximately one-half of the dead embryos from cross 1 are *dpp¹⁶¹/Df(2L)DTD48*. The others are presumably *CyO-P23* homozygotes.

[§]In crosses 2–6, each *dpp* null-bearing second chromosome also contains one or more copies of the chimeric transgene. Five different independent insertions of the transgene were used (designated *TnA–TnE*).

[¶]In crosses 2–6, the male parent was heterozygous for a wild-type (i.e., *dpp*⁺) chromosome. Thus, the only progeny class that could potentially give rise to a large proportion of inviable eggs would be the *dpp¹⁶¹ Tn/Df(2L)DTD48 Tn* offspring. Hence, if this genotype were totally inviable in one of the crosses, 25% dead embryos are expected; this result obtains in crosses 2 and 3. If the genotype is totally viable, essentially no dead embryos are expected; this result obtains in crosses 4–6.

embryonic dorsal–ventral pattern is achieved by one and two copies, respectively, of the *Drosophila* transgene (19). In contrast, the chimeric *dpp–BMP4* construct is less efficient at rescuing this genotype. One or two copies of the chimeric *dpp–BMP4* transgene only achieves partial rescue. To determine whether this partial rescue were simply a quantitative effect or an intrinsic limitation of the chimeric transgene, genotypes containing three or four copies were then tested. Full rescue of the embryonic dorsal–ventral pattern is achieved with both three and four copies of the chimeric transgene as indicated by the proportion of *dpp*[−] individuals that hatch (Table 1; Fig. 3). Thus, we conclude that, in the complete absence of endogenous *dpp* activity, a sufficient level of active chimeric DPP–BMP4 ligand can be generated to lead to a wild-type level of activation of the DPP receptor.

Why is the response of a given dosage of the chimeric transposon less robust than the comparable dosage of the *Drosophila dpp* transgene? Our preferred model is that the human ligand may have a lower affinity for the DPP receptor. The residues that bind to the receptor have not been positively identified so we cannot examine this possibility. One-fourth of the amino acids in the chimera are different from those of DPP and we know that flies are sensitive to the dose and activity of the *dpp* gene. There are other reasonable possibilities to account for the reduced activity of the chimeric gene. For example, it may be that we have altered the rate of proteolytic processing (in spite of our choice for the fusion site between the two genes) since these sites are not well defined. It may be that the DPP propeptide region or some other factor [e.g., tolloid (22)] does not interact with the BMP4 ligand region as efficiently, thus reducing the amount of active protein (23). Our present assay systems are incapable of distinguishing among these possibilities.

We have made a similar chimera between *dpp* and *BMP2*. While not yet tested for its ability to rescue homozygous null *dpp* genotypes, we have found that the one copy of the *dpp–BMP2* chimera fully rescues *dpp* monosomics (that are otherwise inviable), just as the *dpp–BMP4* chimera does (data not shown).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The results of these studies are significant for several reasons. A secreted protein from humans has been shown to function in invertebrates. Most protein swapping experiments have shown conserved function of transcription fac-

tors in heterologous systems (24, 25). Furthermore, our experiments required that normal levels of the protein rescue a mutant phenotype. Most other gene replacement experiments involve overexpression of the heterologous genes to achieve a mutant phenotype, a less stringent criterion of conserved function. The similar structures of the *dpp* and *BMP2/BMP4* transcription units, in conjunction with functional conservation, add strength to the argument that these genes are true evolutionary homologs in the arthropod and vertebrate lineages, respectively.

Given strong arguments for evolutionary and functional conservation of these genes, it may be that they have retained common developmental roles (4, 5, 13, 26, 27). At present, this is difficult to determine. Since it is hard to equate the embryological events between *Drosophila* and vertebrates with our current knowledge, it is difficult to assign a similar developmental function to *dpp*, *BMP2*, and *BMP4*. Furthermore, both of these related human genes are involved in several uncharacterized developmental events, adding further difficulty to correlating developmental functions. However, it is clear from our study that these growth factors do not function to produce one kind of developmental event but rather send cellular signals that are interpreted in the context of the developmental state of the cell. This aspect of this growth factor family has been conserved for at least 600 million years.

The secreted proteins in the TGF- β family are involved in many protein–protein interactions prior to binding their respective cellular receptors (28–31). These protein interactions may be important for processing and/or altering the activity of the growth factor proteins, such as the role postulated for the tolloid/BMP1 proteins (7, 22). Receptors for DPP or any BMP have not been identified to date. However, given the nature of the structural conservations between all TGF- β family members, it is most plausible to expect that DPP and the BMPs act by binding to a transmembrane receptor, thereby initiating a signal transduction cascade. Since the chimeric DPP–BMP4 protein functions in *Drosophila*, then it must be folded properly, processed properly, bound in protein complexes, and presented to the receptor in a manner very similar to the endogenous *Drosophila* protein. Because this experiment was successful, it seems likely that many of the components of the signal transduction pathway have been conserved between *Drosophila* and vertebrates. These studies indicate that insights

we gain by studying these secreted factors in one system can likely be applied to other systems.

We thank Robert Ray for his technical assistance with photography. This work was supported by a Public Health Service grant to W.M.G. and by New Jersey Commission on Cancer funds to R.W.P. For part of this work, R.W.P. was a Charles A. King Trust Fellow at Harvard University.

1. Roberts, A. B., Flanders, K. C., Kondaiah, P., Thompson, N. L., van Obberghen-Schilling, E., Wakefield, L., Rossi, P., de Crombrughe, B., Heine, U. & Sporn, M. B. (1988) *Recent Adv. Horm. Res.* **44**, 157-197.
2. Vale, W., Rivier, J., Vaughan, J., McClintock, R., Corrigan, A., Woo, W., Karr, D. & Spiess, J. (1986) *Nature (London)* **321**, 776-779.
3. Cate, R. L., Mattalliano, R. J., Hession, C., Tizard, R. N., Farber, M., Cheung, A., Ninfa, E. G., Frey, A. Z., Gash, D. J., Chow, E. P., Fisher, R. A., Bertonis, J. M., Torres, G., Wallner, B. P., Ramachandran, K. L., Ragin, R. C., Mangano, T. F., MacLaughlin, D. T. & Donahoe, P. T. (1986) *Cell* **45**, 685-698.
4. Lyons, K. M., Pelton, R. W. & Hogan, B. L. M. (1990) *Development* **109**, 833-844.
5. Jones, C. M., Lyons, K. M. & Hogan, B. L. M. (1991) *Development* **111**, 531-532.
6. Padgett, R. W., St. Johnston, R. D. & Gelbart, W. M. (1987) *Nature (London)* **325**, 81-84.
7. Wozney, J. M., Rosen, V., Celeste, A. J., Mitsock, L. M., Whitters, M. J., Kriz, R. W., Hewick, R. M. & Wang, E. A. (1988) *Science* **242**, 1528-1531.
8. St. Johnston, R. D., Hoffmann, F. M., Blackman, R. K., Segal, D., Grimaldi, R., Padgett, R. W., Irick, H. A. & Gelbart, W. M. (1990) *Genes Dev.* **4**, 1114-1127.
9. Irish, V. & Gelbart, W. M. (1987) *Genes Dev.* **1**, 868-879.
10. Ray, R. P., Arora, K., Nüsslein-Volhard, C. & Gelbart, W. M. (1991) *Development* **113**, 35-54.
11. Sambrook, J., Fritsch, E. F. & Maniatis, T. (1989) *Molecular Cloning: A Laboratory Manual* (Cold Spring Harbor Lab., Plainview, NY).
12. Pirrotta, V. (1986) in *Vectors: A Survey of Molecular Cloning Vectors and Their Uses*, eds. Rodriguez, R. L. & Denhardt, D. T. (Butterworths, London), pp. 437-456.
13. St. Johnston, R. D. & Gelbart, W. M. (1987) *EMBO J.* **6**, 2785-2791.
14. Spencer, F. A., Hoffmann, F. M. & Gelbart, W. M. (1982) *Cell* **28**, 451-461.
15. Lindsley, D. L. & Zimm, G. G. (1992) *The Genome of Drosophila melanogaster* (Academic, New York).
16. Robertson, H. M. & Engels, W. R. (1989) *Genetics* **123**, 815-824.
17. Spradling, A. C. & Rubin, G. M. (1982) *Science* **218**, 341-347.
18. Wieschaus, E. & Nüsslein-Volhard, C. (1986) in *Drosophila: A Practical Approach*, ed. Roberts, D. M. (IRL, Oxford), pp. 199-227.
19. Hoffmann, F. M. & Goodman, W. (1987) *Genes Dev.* **1**, 615-625.
20. Panganiban, G. E. F., Rashka, K. E., Neitzel, M. D. & Hoffmann, F. M. (1990) *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **10**, 2669-2677.
21. Celeste, A. J., Iannuzzi, J. A., Taylor, R. C., Hewick, R. M., Rosen, V., Wang, E. A. & Wozney, J. M. (1990) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **87**, 9843-9847.
22. Shimell, M. J., Ferguson, E. L., Childs, S. R. & O'Connor, M. B. (1991) *Cell* **67**, 469-481.
23. Gray, A. M. & Mason, A. J. (1990) *Science* **247**, 1328-1330.
24. McGinnis, N., Kuziora, M. A. & McGinnis, W. (1990) *Cell* **63**, 969-976.
25. Malicki, J., Schughart, K. & McGinnis, W. (1990) *Cell* **63**, 961-967.
26. Dale, L., Howes, G., Price, B. M. J. & Smith, J. C. (1992) *Development* **115**, 573-585.
27. Jones, M. C., Lyons, K. M., Iapan, P. M., Wright, C. V. E. & Hogan, B. L. M. (1992) *Development* **115**, 639-647.
28. Kanzaki, T., Olofsson, A., Morén, A., Wernstedt, C., Hellman, U., Miyazono, K., Claesson-Welch, L. & Heldin, C.-H. (1990) *Cell* **61**, 1051-1061.
29. Nakamura, T., Takio, K., Eto, Y., Shibai, J., Titani, K. & Sugino, H. (1990) *Science* **247**, 836-838.
30. Yamaguchi, Y., Mann, D. M. & Ruoslahti, E. (1990) *Nature (London)* **346**, 281-284.
31. Miyazono, K., Olofsson, A., Colosetti, P. & Heldin, C.-H. (1991) *EMBO J.* **10**, 1091-1101.